

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1, 6, 7, 9-15 and 18, 21 and 23 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, and 23 are independent. Claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 18 and 23 are hereby amended. Claims 2-5, 8, 16, 17, 19, 20 and 22 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements 35 U.S.C. §112. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the specification. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which the Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 11-13, 16, and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,133,909 to Schein, et al (hereinafter, merely "Schein") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,134,547 to Huxley, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Huxley")

Claims 8-10, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Schein in view of Huxley and further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0014753 to Beach et al. (hereinafter, merely "Beach")

Claims 4 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Schein in view of Huxley and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,966,637 to Kanungo et al.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Schein in view of Huxley and further in view of Beach and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,598,039 to Livowsky et al.

Claims 15 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Schein in view of Huxley and further in view of Livowsky.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Schein in view of Huxley and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,463,428 to Lee et al.

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

"...extracting at least one additional keyword from a dictionary database as a function of the input retrieval keyword,

wherein the at least one additional keyword is relevant to said input retrieval keyword, but belongs to a different genre from the genre of the input retrieval keyword ..."
(Emphasis Added)

As understood by Applicants, Schein relates to a method and apparatus for searching a guide and using a user's input of desired program characteristics to identify particular programs that may be of interest to the user. A user answers questions that aid

identifying desired characteristics of a favorite program and then uses those responses to find other programs that may be of interest. Additionally, when a user is watching a program, the apparatus stores additional programs that may be of interest to the user based upon the program being watched.

As understood by Applicants, Huxley discloses a way of searching a data based on misspelled queries, as well as correlating all the alternate names of persons in the database.

Applicants note that the Office Action indicated that a similar feature in previous claim 8 is taught by Beach. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Cited portions of Beach, specifically Fig. 5 and 6, and paragraph [0022], teach a method of performing a search based on the input retrieval keyword and category. Applicants note that category is used for narrowing a search based on input retrieval keyword.

In the present application, additional keywords in different genres are extracted from the dictionary database and an EPG search is executed based on the input retrieval keyword along with the additional keywords. For example, as claimed in the present invention, if a user inputs a keyword of “Britain” (name of a place), “Queen Elizabeth” (name of a person relevant to the place) is extracted as an additional keyword so that an EPG data search will be based on “Britain” as well as “Queen Elizabeth”.

Applicants submit that nothing has been found in Schein or Beach, taken alone or in combination, that discloses or suggests the above-identified features of independent claim 1. Specifically, Schein, Huxley and Beach fail to teach or suggest extracting a plurality of additional keywords from a dictionary database as a function of the input retrieval keyword, wherein the additional keyword is relevant to said input retrieval keyword, but belongs to a different genre from the genre of the input retrieval keyword, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above, amended independent claims 11 and 23 are patentable.

As understood by Applicants, the other art made of record does not add any disclosure that would render claim 1, 11, or 23 unpatentable.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate the portion, or portions, of the reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800